

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 10, and 16 have been amended. The Examiner is thanked for performing a thorough search.

112 Rejection

In paragraph 2, the Office Action asserts that Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The independent Claims 1, 10, and 16 have been amended to recite “moving” instead of tilting. Among other places, the instant application serial no. 10/032,364, on page 10 line 19 recites moving, for example, by “tilting and rotating.” Further, from page 11 line 33 to page 12 line 31 recites many examples of moving, for example, by “rotating” without any mention of “tilting.” “Tilting,” and “rotating” are both examples of “moving.” Therefore, Applicant believes that amending the independent Claims 1, 10, and 16 to recite “moving” overcomes the 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph rejection.

103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, and 15

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent publication no. 2003/0038928 by Alden (referred to hereinafter as “Alden”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,201,554 by Lands (referred to hereinafter as “Lands”). The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that embodiments of the present invention are neither taught nor suggested by Alden or Lands, alone or in combination.

Amended independent Claim 1 recites, “A display projection system comprising:

an image generator for providing a beam, said beam comprising data to be displayed;

and

an optical component to provide collimation of said beam, wherein said data is

viewable via a projected display and said display projection system is implementable in a

portable electronic device, and wherein functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by moving said display projection system.”

Applicant respectfully agrees with the Office Action’s statement in paragraph 4 that “Alden failed to disclose that function of the projected display to be performed is selectable by tilting the display projection system.” Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that Alden teaches away from “wherein functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by moving said display projection system,” as recited by Claim 1 and therefore Alden cannot be combined with Lands.

For example, Alden states in paragraphs 0009 and 0010 of the summary section,

Further, the means of projection is integrated with a means to stabilize the image...while the user inadvertently jiggles the projector slightly, the image on the remote surface is stationary. Motion and proximity sensors are integrated into the handheld projector/cell phone which communicate through integrated logic with image stabilizers to stabilize the image’s position and size on the remote surface.

Since, Alden requires the image to be stable and uses a stabilizing means to accomplish a stable image, Alden teaches away from “wherein functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by moving said display projection system,” as recited by Claim 1. Lands teaches a device control apparatus but does not teach a display projection system. Since Alden teaches away from “wherein functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by moving said display projection system,” as recited by Claim 1 Alden cannot be combined with Lands’ device control apparatus to render a display projection system with “functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by moving said display projection system” as obvious.

Independent Claim 10 is patentable over Alden in view of Lands for similar reasons that Claim 1 is patentable over Alden in view of Lands. Claims 2-9 depend on Claim 1 and Claims 11-15 depend on Claim 10 and include all of the limitations of the respective independent Claims 1 and 10. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent Claims 2-9 and 11-15 are patentable for at least the reasons that the respective independent Claims are patentable.

Claims 16, 19, 21-23 and 25-27

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, Claims 16, 19, 21-23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alden in view of U.S. patent publication 2002/0175915 by Lichtfuss (referred to hereinafter as “Lichtfuss”) and further in view of Lands. The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that embodiments of the present invention are neither taught nor suggested by Alden, Lichtfuss, or Lands, alone or in combination.

As already stated, neither Alden nor Lands teach or suggest “wherein functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by moving said display projection system.” Lichtfuss does not remedy the shortcomings in Alden and Lands because neither Alden, Lichtfuss, nor Lands teach or suggest “wherein functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by moving said display projection system,” as recited by Claim 16. In fact, the Office Action does not even assert that Lichtfuss teaches or suggests “wherein functions of said projected display to be performed are selectable by moving said display projection system,” as recited by Claim 16.

Claims 17-27 depend on Claim 16 and include all of the limitations of independent Claim 16. In one example, Claim 27 recites “the shape and size of said portable electronic device is penlike.” The Office Action states, “Alden in view of Lichtfuss does not disclose that the shape and size of the portable electronic device is pen-like. However, change in size or shape is a

matter of design choice and such a ‘pen-like’ size and shape is functionally equivalent to the size and shape of the hand-held projector of Alden.” Applicant agrees that neither Alden nor Lichtfuss teach “the shape and size of said portable electronic device is penlike. Applicant respectfully disagrees that “the shape and size of said portable electronic device is penlike” is obvious in light of Alden and Lichtfuss. Alden and Lichtfuss disclose hand held devices that are approximately the size of a person’s palm. Inventiveness is required not only to realize that there is a need for a device that is “penlike” but to enable the implantation of a device by one of ordinary skill in the art that is “penlike.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 17-27 are patentable for at least the reasons that independent Claim 16 is patentable.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-27. The examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO

Date: 4/29, 2006

John P. Wagner
Reg. No. 35,398
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060